REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Office Action of February 19, 2008 is requested.

A.   35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, claims 4, 17, 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, for being indefinite in meaning. In particular, the Examiner asserted at page 2 of the

Office Action that it was unclear "how to coordinating (sic) the management of the technical

parameter" and on what factor to coordinate the management. Applicants traverse the rejection in

that the claims are clear in meaning. The Examiner appears to be attempting to limit the recited

"coordinating" to be based on a particular factor. This is improper. Applicants are not required to

limit their invention to a particular embodiment. As long as the claims are supported by the

specification and clear in meaning, as they are in this case, they are proper under 35 U.S.C. § 112,

second paragraph, and so the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

B.   35 U.S.C. § 103

1.   Raverdy et al. and Daniels

a.   Claims 2-6

Claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Raverdy et al.,

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0068631 A1, and Daniels, U.S. Patent No.

5,758,126. Applicants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, independent claim 4 recites

presenting a message regarding at least one technical parameter of a remote processing system on a

user interface for review, wherein a technical parameter includes information related to operation

characteristics of a remote data processing system. The Examiner at page 4 of the Office Action

has asserted that Raverdy et al.'s disclosure of presenting the certificate 810 regards presenting a

message as recited in claim 4. A review of paragraphs 0082-0087 of Raverdy et al. reveals that the

certificate regards a document that includes information pertinent to participants in a game. Such

information can include the identity of one or more award winners, owner information, certificate

usage history, etc. (See paragraphs 0083-0084 of Raverdy et al.). Since the information on the

certificate does not pertain to a technical parameter as defined in claim 4, the Examiner's assertion

has no merit. Furthermore, there is no reason given in Daniels et al. to provide information related

to operation characteristics of a remote data processing system on Raverdy et al.'s certificate.

Accordingly, the rejection is improper.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that independent claim 4 recites that

"coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a

trading group" is done automatically and without user involvement. As conceded by the Examiner

at page 4 of the Office Action, Raverdy et al. does not disclose such automatic coordinating. The

Examiner has relied on Daniels et al. to cure the deficiencies of Raverdy et al. In particular, the

Examiner has relied on Daniels et al.'s EDI transfer of data as providing a reason to alter Raverdy et

al. to coordinate management of at least one technical parameter. Applicants disagree. Daniels

discloses that EDI "is the direct application to application transmission of business documents such

as purchase orders, invoices and remittance order" (Col. 1, ll. 29-32). There is no disclosure in

Daniels et al. that such data are to be used to coordinate management of a technical parameter that

includes information related to operation characteristics of a remote data processing system as

required by claim 4. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejections of 2, 3, 5 and 6, which depend directly on claim 4, should be withdrawn

for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 4.

b.   Claims 17-21

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Raverdy et

al. and Daniels. Applicants traverse the rejection. In particular, independent claim 17 recites "an

interpreter for interpreting, without human intervention, the report message for presentation on a

user interface and for automatically, without user involvement, coordinating the management of

the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a trading group." As mentioned

above at pages 13-15 in Section B.1.a, neither Raverdy et al. nor Daniels discloses: 1) presenting

a report message on a user interface that regards a technical parameter that includes information

related to operation characteristics of a remote data processing system and 2) automatically,

without user involvement, coordinating management of a technical parameter. Accordingly, the

rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 18-21, which depend directly on claim 17, should be withdrawn for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 17.

Note that claim 17 has been amended to correct an obvious typographical error. Accordingly, the amendments made to claim 17 are not being made for reasons related to patentability as defined in *Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd*, 234 F.3d 558, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (*en banc*), *overruled in part*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002).

c.   Claims 22-28

Claims 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Raverdy et al. and Daniels. Independent claim 22 recites "the remote data processing system is revised automatically and without intervention of a user when the received technical parameter data does not comply with the retrieved reference technical parameter data." For reasons similar to those given above at pages 13-15 in Section B.1.a, neither Raverdy et al. nor Daniels discloses revising automatically without intervention of a user a remote data processing system when received technical parameter data does not comply with retrieved reference technical parameter data. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 22 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 23-28, which depend directly on claim 22, should be withdrawn for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 22.

2.   Raverdy et al., Daniels and Kidder

Claims 8-16 and 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of

Raverdy et al., Daniels and Kidder, U.S. Patent No. 6,455,774. Independent claim 29 recites that

the revision of the remote data processing system is done automatically and without user

involvement should "the received technical parameter data of the message does not comply with

retrieved reference technical parameter data", wherein technical parameter data includes

information related to operation characteristics of a remote data processing system. Since not one

of Raverdy et al., Daniels or Kidder discloses the recited revision of the remote data processing

system, the rejection of claim 29 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 8-16, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 29, should be

withdrawn for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 29.

The rejections of claims 11 and 14 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that

Raverdy et al. fails to disclose installing an upgrade software module after receipt of

confirmation that a requisite hardware upgrade has been successfully completed as recited in the

claims. For example, the passages of Raverdy et al. relied on by the Examiner at pages 15 and 18

of the Office Action are silent as to the recited receipt of confirmation. Since there is no reason

based on Daniels, Kidder or other sources to alter Raverdy et al. to perform the recited receipt of

confirmation, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejections of claims 12 and 15 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that

Raverdy et al. fails to disclose delaying transmission of a revision (claim 12) or a desired version

of an upgrade software module (claim 15) if same software components (claim 12) or same

software modules (claim 15) are not specified in the reference technical parameter data and the

received technical parameter data. The passages of Raverdy et al. relied on by the Examiner at

pages 15-17 and 19 of the Office Action are silent as to the recited delaying transmission. Since

there is no reason based on Daniels, Kidder or other sources to alter Raverdy et al. to perform the

recited delaying transmission, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that Raverdy et

al. fails to disclose revising a reference parameters storage as recited in the claim. The passages

of Raverdy et al. relied on by the Examiner at page 17 of the Office Action are silent as to the

recited revising. Since there is no reason based on Daniels, Kidder or other sources to alter

Raverdy et al. to perform the recited revising, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending

claims 2-6 and 8-30 are in condition for allowance and seek an early allowance thereof. If for any

reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that

an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to contact the undersigned attorneys at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Freeman
Registration No. 34,483
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER
 GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: April 21, 2008